UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/583,520	05/31/2000	Jerry Walter Malcolm	AUS000070US1	2499

7590 04/21/2004

BRACEWELL & PATTERSON, L.L.P.
Intellectual Property Law
P.O. Box 969
Austin, TX 78767-0969

EXAMINER	
BLACKWELL, JAMES H	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2004

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PRG

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/583,520	MALCOLM, JERRY WALTER	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James H Blackwell	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 February 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *31 May 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to the Amendment filed 02/10/2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 8-10, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maxwell et al. (hereinafter Maxwell, U.S. Patent No. 6,589,290) in view of Courtner ("Mastering Microsoft Office 2000, Professional Edition", 04/1999).

In regard to independent Claim 1 (and similarly to independent Claims 8, and 15), Maxwell teaches that a web client is capable of obtaining forms from the Internet and contains computer code configured to allow a user to populate a form with data (Col. 9, lines 32-34; compare to Claim 1 (and similarly to Claims 8, and 15), ***"... receiving, from a user by a browser application executed in a client system, data for a form in a web page"***). Maxwell also teaches that if a user completes field (945-947) of form (905) and submits it to server (920) via submission path (915), server (920) can place the data submitted by the user in a cookie (931) by sending web client (910) data via path (925). If the user returns to form (905) again Web browser (930) executing at web client (910) may use the data saved in cookie (931) to populate fields (945-947) with the data previously entered by the user (Col. 6, lines 25-33; Fig. 9). Maxwell also teaches that a cookie contains the following parameters: NAME=VALUE;

expires=DATE; path=PATH; domain=DOMAIN_NAME; secure. The NAME and VALUE parameter contain the information included in the cookie (form field identifier NAME-VALUE form data value). DATE is the time at which the cookie expires and is thus no longer saved on web client (210). DOMAIN is the host address or domain name for which the cookie is valid. The PATH parameter specifies a subset of URL's at the appropriate domain for which the cookie is valid. If the keyword secure is used then the cookie is only transmitted over a secure connection. All of these parameters except the NAME=VALUE are optional to set a cookie. Once the Set-Cookie command is sent to web client (400) a cookie (460) is placed on web client (400) (Col. 6, lines 25-36; compare to Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 8, and 15), ***"... prior to submission of the form with the data to a server system hosting the web page, saving an address of the web page, the data provided from the user for the form, and at least one field identifier for associating the data to at least one respective field of the form ..."***). Maxwell also teaches that a cookie is an HTTP header that consists of a text-only string. The text-string is entered into the *memory* of a web client and is accessible by the web browser (Col. 6, lines 13-15; compare with Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 8, and 15), ***"... into a volatile memory system of the client system ..."***). Maxwell does not specifically teach *volatile memory* or *wherein the address, the data, and the at least one field identifier are still stored in the volatile memory system after the browser application is closed*. However, Courtner teaches a clipboard, which is inherently volatile storage and is available to any Windows application (including browsers) (pp. 38-40). Since the clipboard is available to all Windows applications, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to store information about a form (here in the form of a cookie) in the clipboard providing the benefit of being accessible even if the browser had been exited and reentered.

In regard to dependent Claim 2 (and similarly to dependent Claims 9, and 16), Maxwell teaches that the form completion program examines each template file in order to determine if one or more of the template files resembles the form image to within a certain threshold. If a template file that resembles the form image to within a certain threshold is located, then the form completion acknowledges that a match occurred. When a match occurs the form completion program utilizes the template file to identify what kind of data to insert into each of the form's data receptacles. For example, the template file allows the form completion program to determine which of the data receptacles contain personal information and which data receptacles contain payment information. Once the form completion program successfully identifies what kind of data to insert into each data receptacle the program begins to input the appropriate kind of data into the appropriate data receptacle (Col. 8, lines 40-55; compare to Claim 2 (and similarly Claims 9, and 16), ***"... in response to the user opening the browser application that had been closed and again requesting retrieval of the web page, retrieving the web page from the server system; detecting a match between the saved address and the address of the retrieved web page and, in response to detecting a match between the saved address and the address of the retrieved web page, automatically filling in the form of the web page with the data stored in the volatile memory system"***).

In regard to dependent Claim 3 (and similarly dependent Claims 10, and 17), Maxwell teaches that the form completion program examines each template file in order to determine if one or more of the template files resembles the form image to within a certain threshold. If a template file that resembles the form image to within a certain threshold is located, then the form completion acknowledges that a match occurred. When a match occurs the form completion program utilizes the template file to identify what kind of data to insert into each of the form's data receptacles. For example, the template file allows the form completion program to determine which of the data receptacles contain personal information and which data receptacles contain payment information. Once the form completion program successfully identifies what kind of data to insert into each data receptacle the program begins to input the appropriate kind of data into the appropriate data receptacle (Col. 8, lines 40-55; compare to Claim 3 (and similarly Claims 10, and 17), ***"... parsing, by the browser application, the data for the form; and displaying, by the browser application, the form with the data"***).

Claims 4, 11, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maxwell in view of Courtner and in further view of Kikinis (U.S. Patent No. 5,794,259).

In regard to dependent Claim 4, Maxwell fails to teach *automatically filling in the form of the web page with the data only in response to the user responding with an affirmative response to a query by the browser application.* However, Kikinis teaches information such as name, address, home phone number, business phone number,

facsimile number, E-Mail address, company, and so on, is stored and accessible by the control code by association with a name tag. When a user encounters a form on the Internet, and wishes to fill in the form, he/she hits a "hot key", or key combination, which invokes the control code which populates the form (Col. 3, lines 58-67; Col. 4, lines1-4; compare to Claim 4, ***"... automatically filling in the form of the web page with the data only in response to the user responding with an affirmative response to a query by the browser application regarding whether the user wishes to fill in the form with the data saved in the volatile memory system"***). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Maxwell, Courtner, and Kikinis providing the benefit of a pipeline for quickly and efficiently filling fields in forms.

In regard to dependent Claim 11 (and similarly dependent Claim 18), Maxwell fails to teach *said system further comprises means for querying, by the browser application, whether the user wishes to fill in the form using the data saved in the volatile memory system in response to a match between the address of the requested web page and the address stored in the volatile memory system; said means for automatically filling comprises means for automatically filling said form only in response to the browser application receiving an indication that the user wishes to fill in the form with the data saved in the volatile memory system.* However, Kikinis teaches information such as name, address, home phone number, business phone number, facsimile number, E-Mail address, company, and so on, is stored and accessible by the control code by association with a name tag. When a user encounters a form on the

Internet, and wishes to fill in the form, he/she hits a "hot key", or key combination, which invokes the control code which populates the form (Col. 3, lines 58-67; Col. 4, lines1-4; compare to Claim 11 (and similarly to Claim 18), ***"... said system further comprises means for querying, by the browser application, whether the user wishes to fill in the form using the data saved in the volatile memory system in response to a match between the address of the requested web page and the address stored in the volatile memory system; said means for automatically filling comprises means for automatically filling said form only in response to the browser application receiving an indication that the user wishes to fill in the form with the data saved in the volatile memory system"***). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Maxwell. Courtner, and Kikinis providing the benefit of a pipeline for quickly and efficiently filling fields in forms.

Claims 5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maxwell in view of Courtner and in further view of Brown (hereinafter Brown, U.S. Patent No. 6,587,822).

In regard to dependent Claim 5 (and similarly dependent Claim 12), Maxwell fails to teach *determining whether the requested web page has a submittable form; and only in response to the requested web page having the submittable form, implementing, by the browser application, the receiving and saving steps.* However, Brown teaches a voice processor (114) in IVR platform (102) takes the output from the HTML parser

(112) and further analyzes the corresponding retrieved HTML web page to identify structure such as, for example, section headings, tables, frames, and forms (Col. 4, lines 64-67; Col. 5, line 1; compare to Claim 5 (and similarly Claim 12), ***"... determining whether the requested web page has a submittable form; and only in response to the requested web page having the submittable form, implementing, by the browser application, the receiving and saving steps"***). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Maxwell, Courtner, and Brown providing the benefit of identifying HTML web page structures such as forms.

Claims 6, 13, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maxwell in view of Courtner.

In regard to dependent Claim 6 (and similarly dependent Claims 13, and 20), Maxwell fails to teach *calling a clipboard operation of an operating system on which the browser application operates to save the address, the data, and the at least one field identifier into the volatile memory system.* However, Courtner teaches a Windows Clipboard that is accessible from any Windows application (including browsers). Items can be copied to, or typed into a Clipboard (pp. 38-40; compare to Claim 6 (and similarly Claims 13, and 20), ***"... calling a clipboard operation of an operating system on which the browser application operates to save the address, the data, and the at least one field identifier into the volatile memory system"***). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine

the teachings of Maxwell and Courtner providing the benefit of a predetermined, and system wide accessible location for temporary storage.

Claims 7, 14, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maxwell in view of Courtner and in further view of Cowart ("Mastering Windows 3.1, Special Edition", 1993).

In regard to dependent Claim 7 (and similarly dependent Claims 14, and 21), Maxwell fails to teach that *in response to the data for the form being successfully submitted to the server system and the browser application receiving a request for a next web page from the user, erasing the data from the volatile memory system.* However, Cowart teaches clearing a Clipboard, whose contents are stored in RAM memory to free up memory space for storage of new items (p. 256; compare to Claim 7 (and similarly Claims 14, and 21), ***"... in response to the data for the form being successfully submitted to the server system and the browser application receiving a request for a next web page from the user, erasing the data from the volatile memory system"***). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Maxwell, Courtner, and Cowart providing the benefit of freeing RAM memory for other uses.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maxwell in view of Courtner and in further view of Kikinis and in further view of Brown.

In regard to dependent Claim 19, Maxwell fails to teach *determining whether the requested web page has a submittable form; and only in response to the requested web page having the submittable form, implementing, by the browser application, the receiving and saving steps*. However, Brown teaches a voice processor (114) in IVR platform (102) takes the output from the HTML parser (112) and further analyzes the corresponding retrieved HTML web page to identify structure such as, for example, section headings, tables, frames, and forms (Col. 4, lines 64-67; Col. 5, line 1; compare to Claim 19, ***"... determining whether the requested web page has a submittable form; and only in response to the requested web page having the submittable form, implementing, by the browser application, the receiving and saving steps"***). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Maxwell, Courtner, Kikinis, and Brown providing the benefit of identifying HTML web page structures such as forms.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H Blackwell whose telephone number is 703-305-0940. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 703-305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell
04/15/04

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER